

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Thursday, October 2, 2008, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present: Tim Taylor, Chair
Karen Daniels, Vice-Chair
Sheri Van Bibber
Jim Harland
Ray Black
Tim Tingey, Community & Economic Development Director
Ray Christensen, Senior Planner
G.L. Critchfield, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

Excused: Kurtis Aoki
Jeff Evans

The Staff Review meeting was held from 6:00 to 6:30 p.m. The planning commission members briefly reviewed the applications on the agenda. An audio recording of this is available at the Murray City Community and Economic Department.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Tim Taylor asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of July 17, August 7, August 21, September 4, 2008. Sheri Van Bibber made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Seconded by Ray Black.

A voice vote was made. The minutes were approved unanimously (5-0).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest for this agenda.

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Val John Halford and Kevin Fayles were present to represent this request. Mr. Halford stated he is representing Wasatch Front Regional Council. Mr. Halford presented a publication entitled Wasatch Choices 2040 which is a planning effort initiated several years ago. He stated that the roads cannot be built fast enough to meet the demands predicted by the year 2040. He stated if the transportation dilemma is widening roads, building new infrastructure and land use. This is an attempt to reach out to planning commissions and hopefully gather support for the need to revisit land use and in particular, the general plan. Having talked to Mr. Tingey and Mr. Christensen the city is in the middle of a planning effort to update the general plan with regards to transit oriented and mixed use areas.

Mr. Halford showed a power point presentation and explained that the 2040 plan was a joint effort between two metropolitan organizations along the Wasatch Front, which was the Regional Council that represents the three urbanized counties of Davis, Weber and Salt Lake County and Mountain Land Association of Governments. There were a series of public workshops in which there were four distinct development scenarios of the future looking to the year 2040, which resulted in a vision for the entire area from the northern border of Box Elder County and Weber County to Salt Lake and Utah County. Within the four county area, by the year 2040, there will be an increase of approximately 1.3 million people. This was developed in conjunction with

Envision Utah and their planning expertise. Everyone who lives here, knows that there are geographic barriers such as the Wasatch National Forest, Oquirrh Mountains and the Great Salt Lake. A question is what do you do when the last house is built with regard to density, mixed uses and increased development around transit nodes? He indicated five strategies for local governments to consider: 1- As you develop the plans, in particular land re-use plans, consider in-fill that might be denser than current zoning allows; 2- preserve today transportation corridors for tomorrow. In the past, there has been a poor job done due to inadequate funding. There is funding available through the state legislature to begin purchase of lands to preserve corridors for future needs. 3- Create walkable communities; 4- Plan for job centers such as economic development readiness; 5- Maximize conservation of critical lands.

Mr. Halford stated that some of the ideas that resulted from the vision: mixed use centers coordinated with transportation corridors; land use itself emphasizes a transportation network of connectivity; access to critical lands and conservation of green infrastructure.

The vision itself does project an idea of how the city could incorporate the growth principles found in this document and utilize such in the next land use plan.

The benefits of the vision are concerned about traffic congestion, driving distances, the rise in vehicles miles traveled, and vacant land by 2040. Most households have a minimum 2-3 vehicles. If the city can increase mixed use type developments and increase between 4-13% in new growth alone, it would result in 18% less congestion, 12 % more transit use, and 23 fewer square miles of land consumed by the year 2040.

Kevin Fayles stated he is representing Envision Utah. Mr. Fayles stated that the survey was conducted by Harris Interactive, which is a well respected survey company. Last year Harris Interactive compared research conducted 1 year ago with research conducted 10 years. He said growth was one of the top concerns of the residents. He stated that if equity is not considered in a home, the majority of persons could not afford their homes today. In a survey conducted, an overwhelming 75% of Utahns are concerned a mix of housing types, and the residents want to see more moderate single family homes and townhomes. Other desires are a neighborhood demographic mix with ages, public transportation options nearby such as the village style is the preference, and open spaces nearby. The question is, are the communities being designed to meet these desires?

Mr. Fayles stated that 79% of future home buyers are earning less than \$35,000/year. The housing market has changed considerably. The Daybreak Community is supported by the Envision Utah and would not have been developed without the help of Envision Utah. Murray City is basically landlocked and these types of walkable and mixed uses make more sense. People like services and facilities within 5 minutes of their community.

Mr. Fayles stated that Salt Lake County has 331 incorporated square miles out of 600 total square miles. Mixed use in the vision would be 15.2 square miles and 5% of the incorporated land would have the mixed use which equates 2.5% of the total land. Murray City's population estimates in 2030 will be an increased by 20,000. GPOB estimates, if the vision is followed, through mixed use planning the population could be increased by 30,100. GPOB estimates by 2030 there will be 20,000 more jobs. If the principles are implemented with this vision, just over half of the 20,000 new jobs would be within the mixed use area. Murray City is approximately 10

square miles and the mixed use area would be approximately 1 square mile that could be around the TOD sites and the downtown area.

Mr. Halford stated this meeting is an attempt to win the commission to the growth principles found in Wasatch Choice's 2040 to the degree where the chairman would join them to meet with the city council to formally adopt the growth principles found in the Wasatch Choice 2040. He stated that ultimately they will be visiting all 45 communities along the wasatch front and that something needs to happen, they believe these growth principles are the answer.

Jim Harland stated that one square mile does not seem to be much area, but in Murray City that is quite a bit when considering that Murray City is only 10 square miles. Mr. Taylor stated that the area that the city is considering to be in the new mixed use zones, would be close to 3/4 square mile. He stated that Murray City has wonderful potential because there are three Trax stations and a front runner station soon coming.

Mr. Fayles stated there are some communities up and down the wasatch front over the last few months where these growth principles are more applicable to Murray City because the city is landlocked and development can only go up. Over time these growth principles have far more applicability than other cities such as Bluffdale or Herriman. He stated the reality is, over time given the projections, we're going to have to put these people some place.

Mr. Taylor stated that the city council has done a fantastic job with the TOD and infill ordinances, etc.

Mr. Halford and Mr. Fayles thanked the commission for their time and consideration.

PLANNING COMMISSION POLICIES & PROCEDURES

Tim Tingey, Community & Economic Development Director, stated the planning staff has made recommended changes to the policies and procedures and are summarized as follows: 1- Wording that would allow an additional term for the chair; 2- If neither the chair or vice-chair is present at a meeting, the person that has served the longest amount of time would automatically chair the meeting; 3- When regularly scheduled meeting dates fall on a recognized national or state holiday, the meeting may be rescheduled as directed by the planning commission chair; 4- The order of business not be set in stone and may have flexibility based on the agenda items and potential length of time to be reviewed; 5- Protocol for running a meeting; 6- The commission adopt a findings of fact after a motion is made for agenda items and be prepared by staff and signed by the chair or vice-chair within five working days after a decision is made; 7- Handouts and materials submitted by the applicants and other will be encouraged to be submitted at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. If the materials are submitted less the 48 hours prior to the meeting, the commission may decide to postpone a decision on the agenda item. There were also additional minor modifications as ell.

Sheri Van Bibber asked the required distance for public notices. Mr. Christensen responded the notification time frame is 10 days prior to the meeting date.

Mr. Tingey stated that the staff is recommending approval of the proposed recommendations and amendments to the Planning Commission Policies & Procedures as outlined.

Mr. Taylor suggested switching items 3 and 4 on the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Protocol.

Karen Daniels made a motion to adopt the Planning Commission Policies & Procedures dated September 26, 2008 as outlined and reversing items #3 and #4 on the Meeting Protocol and as noted on the document. Seconded by Sheri Van Bibber.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen.

<u>A</u>	Mr. Black
<u>A</u>	Ms. Van Bibber
<u>A</u>	Mr. Taylor
<u>A</u>	Ms. Daniels
<u>A</u>	Mr. Harland

Motion passed, 5-0.

Mr. Black requested that a final draft be sent to the Planning Commission with the indicated changes.

G.L. Critchfield commented on the importance of the planning commission using the Findings of Fact policy for each agenda item as outlined in the Policies & Procedures.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Meeting adjourned.

Ray Christensen, AICP
Senior Planner